

OPINIONS OF THE SUPREME COURT OF OHIO

**** SUBJECT TO FURTHER EDITING ****

The full texts of the opinions of the Supreme Court of Ohio are being transmitted electronically beginning May 27, 1992, pursuant to a pilot project implemented by Chief Justice Thomas J. Moyer.

Please call any errors to the attention of the Reporter's Office of the Supreme Court of Ohio. Attention: Walter S. Kobalka, Reporter, or Deborah J. Barrett, Administrative Assistant. Tel.: (614) 466-4961; in Ohio 1-800-826-9010. Your comments on this pilot project are also welcome.

NOTE: Corrections may be made by the Supreme Court to the full texts of the opinions after they have been released electronically to the public. The reader is therefore advised to check the bound volumes of Ohio St.3d published by West Publishing Company for the final versions of these opinions. The advance sheets to Ohio St.3d will also contain the volume and page numbers where the opinions will be found in the bound volumes of the Ohio Official Reports.

Purnell, Appellant, v. Orthopaedic Offices, Inc., Appellee
(1994), Ohio St.3d .]

Employer and employee -- Sex and handicap discrimination --

R.C. 4112.99 is a remedial statute and is subject to R.C.
2305.07's six-year limitations period.

(No. 94-1701 -- Submitted November 15, 1994 -- Decided
December 14, 1994.)

Appeal from the Court of Appeals for Hamilton County, No.
C-930176.

Jacobs, Kleinman, Seibel & McNally and Mark J. Byrne, for
appellant.

Thompson, Hine & Flory and Deborah DeLong, for appellee.

The judgment of the court of appeals is reversed and the
cause is remanded to the trial court on the authority of
Cosgrove v. Williamsburg of Cincinnati Mgt. Co. Inc. (1994), 70
Ohio St.3d 281, 638 N.E.2d 991.

A.W. Sweeney, Douglas, Wright, Resnick and Pfeifer, JJ.,
concur.

Moyer, C.J., concurs separately.

F.E. Sweeney, J., dissents.

No. 94-1701
Moyer, C.J., Concurring
Separately
December 2, 1994
File No. 8451
Doc. No. 2397Y

Moyer, C.J., concurring separately. I concur separately
in the judgment entry in the above-styled case. As stated in
the concurring opinion in Cosgrove v. Williamsburg of

Cincinnati Mgt. Co., Inc. (1994), 70 Ohio St.3d 281, 638 N.E.2d 991, I do not agree with the law announced in the majority decision. Nevertheless, it is the law on the issue in the above-styled case. As I believe all parties should receive equal application of the law announced by this court, and only for that reason, I concur in the judgment entry.